

MARCH 6, 1970

Center for the Study of  
Democracy

made a point of stressing the durability of Franco-American friendship. But, it takes two to make friends—and certainly French actions in recent years with regard to gold, Vietnam, NATO, and now jets to Libya have made many Americans perplexed and unhappy.

The Pompidou government's actions to date have shown that Gualliam has unfortunately survived De Gaulle. No wonder many Americans are asking—Lafayette—where are you?

French maneuverings in the Middle East since the 1967 war have been outrageous. There is a yawning gap between France's avowed neutrality and her actual deeds. At least the Russians are candid in their support of the Arabs.

The French government's speed in taking over American interests in Libya has truly been amazing. They might not even have to cut the grass around the runways at our Wheelus Air Force Base after we depart.

In much of the recent public discussion of United States policy towards Israel, emotion, and a lack of perspective have characterized much of the debate.

Too often overlooked is the bedrock issue of how Israel serves American interests in the Middle East: Israel's role as a definite strategic asset to the United States cannot be stressed strongly enough.

If we look at the basic interests of all the parties involved—what do we find?

It is clearly in the interest of the Soviet Union to aid and encourage Arab hostility against Israel stopping short of an armed confrontation with the United States.

It is in the interest of the Arab rulers to stoke the fires of hatred against Israel. This conceals their own shortcomings in caring for the needs of their own peoples. This also provides the only basis for the facade of Arab unity.

It is in the interest of Arab terrorist groups to perpetuate the illusion of the Middle East as a powder keg. Of all the parties concerned, they have the least to lose—and with this realization goes their cowardly and uncivilized behavior.

It is in the interest of Great Britain and France to preserve the illusion that they are on the same international level with the United States and Russia by promoting continued "Big Four" talks. At the same time, these two peace-makers are actually pursuing their own selfish interests in the area by selling French Mirage jets and British Chieftan tanks to the Arabs—while denying these weapons to Israel.

And, finally, we can describe Israel's overriding interest in one word—survival.

Israeli comments on the Administration's recent initiatives have been made more in sorrow than in anger. After all, what is there to do when a well-meaning but perhaps too nervous friend tries to do what he considers is best for everybody by giving away your most valued possession as a start?

In Israel's case, her trump card and crucial bargaining point in trying to get her Arab neighbors to negotiate has been the territory it occupied in June of 1967.

In essence, our government's latest proposal would pull the rug out from under Israel's feet.

By proposing a detailed, comprehensive settlement, including specific border arrangements, little is left to the parties themselves to hammer out.

These proposals represent a definite change from our previously stated positions since the Six-Day war. If peace is to finally come between Israel and the Arabs, it must be based upon explicit mutual recognition and respect—if not full reconciliation. This can be achieved only through negotiated agreements by the parties involved.

With the best of intentions and good faith, our State Department has allowed itself to

be outclassed and outmaneuvered by the Soviets in the past few months.

We have been left with egg 'a la Russe on our faces as a result of the Soviet backtracking. The Israelis are faced with a serious undercutting of their bargaining position. Fortunately, is not too late to reverse ourselves and face up to the facts of life—and death in the Middle East. If this means countering lavish French and Russian arms shipments to the Arabs by selling more Skyhawks and Phantom jets to Israel—this must be done.

The planes aside—the message will not be lost on Israel's enemies. It is not necessary to invoke sentiment, guilt-feelings and past history to justify American support for Israel. In the cold light of international politics, Israel is America's most valuable asset in the Middle East today.

To get an understanding of this role, Israel may be viewed as a dam preventing Soviet pressures from building up against Turkey, Iran, and Ethiopia—as well as the more moderate Arab governments. But, it should be equally obvious that only a well-armed Israel, within secure borders, and with a strong economy can withstand the Soviet pressures.

If we attempt to abate the Soviet flood southward by punching small holes in the dam, temporary results might be achieved. But inevitably, the barrier would be weakened and the Russian tide would sweep throughout the Middle East and Africa.

Any deterioration of Israel's position as a result of American actions would be viewed by the Arabs as a Soviet triumph and a sign of Soviet strength. Unless the U.S. were to completely repudiate Israel and assume an active role in preparing for Israel's destruction, we cannot hope to compete on even terms with the Soviets in currying favor with the extremist governments in the Arab world. It is inconceivable that the United States should want to compete on these terms.

There is another aspect of U.S.-Middle East policy which is overemphasized and misunderstood—oil.

A basic truth here is that the United States is not dependent on Middle Eastern oil.

We hardly use any of it now—and there is little reason to think we ever will. Just look at our own vast resources and those of nearby Venezuela, Canada, and Alaska, for the reasons why.

For years now there has been a glut of oil in the world markets—and the prospects are that it will remain so. New oil development is proceeding rapidly all over the globe—in Indonesia, Nigeria, Alaska and the Soviet Union, just as a few examples.

Western Europe to be sure, would suffer somewhat from a cut-off of Middle East supplies. But past experience has shown that it is the "have-nots" of the Arab nations who shout the loudest—and the "haves" who sell their oil to the West because no one else will buy it.

The big American oil companies are in business to make profits. We cannot quarrel with them about this—even if they do pollute our beaches occasionally. They would seem to be ill-equipped and lack the proper perspective to make "even-handed" judgments on the national interests of the U.S. There is more to American foreign policy in the Middle East than the protection of oil investments.

There is another myth, sometimes expressed in the vicinity of Foggy Bottom—where our State Department is appropriately located. This is that Israel is at the root of the troubles plaguing our so-called "friends" in the Middle East.

Without a strong Israel these past twenty years, what would have been the chances of the Jordanian and Lebanese governments surviving until 1970? The winds of change sweeping over the Arab world probably would

have toppled more Arab governments by now. Democracy if not for Israel.

If our policies toward Israel are to be truly more "even-handed" this must mean that Israel will not be left "empty-handed".

At tremendous sacrifices to her economy and her people, Israel has been paying cash on the barrel-head for the sophisticated weaponry she needs to counter the huge number of planes and tanks in the hands of her enemies.

If our government is truly seeking a "better balanced" policy in this area, let it pay closer attention to the arms balance. The U.S. in its own best interests must assure that Israel does not fall behind in this critical race. How long can Israel bear the burden of spending 25% of her Gross National Product on defense? We spend 7%.

Courage, skill and blood can make up for vastly inferior numbers of weapons and men—but not forever and not without damage to the quality of Israeli society. I would hate to see another generation of Israelis growing up to be fighter pilots, tank commanders and artillerymen rather than physicists, musicians and doctors. But, as the Israelis say—"ein brera"—there is no choice for the time being, anyway.

With the realization of how Israel is steadfastly serving the interests of the United States in the Greater Middle East, a small investment now by our country in ensuring Israel's future security would yield considerable dividends.

If Israel is willing to endure until the Arab governments she has beaten three times on the battlefield are ready to negotiate, why is the U.S. in such a hurry? Israel is merely asking our country to be patient, and not to lessen her support.

The Russians have always shown an appreciation of military power as a factor in international relations.

They are not blind to the military prowess of the Israeli defense forces and the lack of it on the part of their own clients. The U.S. should exploit Israel's strength, not seek to dissipate and squander it in vain efforts to placate the Arab regimes.

While the United States in its global chess game with the Soviet Union can afford to "win a couple, and lose a couple", the Israelis with an area the size of New Jersey and a population roughly that of our own state of Connecticut lack this flexibility.

If Israel is pressured into a mistake by our own country at this critical juncture in her history, it could mean another 2,000 years of the Diaspora.

## MILITARISM IN AMERICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the January issue of the Center magazine, published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, contains an article written by Donald McDonald, entitled "Militarism in America." It is a thoughtful and thorough study of the influence of the military on our society, our Government, and our foreign policy. I commend it to the attention of Senators and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### MILITARISM IN AMERICA (By Donald McDonald)

Is the United States a militarized society? Two quick—and contradictory—answers can be given to this question. The "yes" answer is usually based on a few pieces of evidence; military expenditures and the Vietnam war are the ones most often cited. The "no" an-